



DOCKET NO.: E0295.70119US00

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: David Black  
Serial No.: 09/605,552  
Confirmation No.: 5747  
Filed: June 27, 2000  
For: METHODS AND APPARATUS FOR VERIFYING STORAGE  
ACCESS REQUESTS IN A COMPUTER STORAGE SYSTEM WITH  
MULTIPLE STORAGE ELEMENTS  
Examiner: Neveen Abel-Jalil  
Art Unit: 2165

---

**PROPOSED AGENDA FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for granting a telephone interview scheduled for Tuesday, November 15, 2005 at 10:00 a.m. The following agenda is proposed.

- Applicant would like to discuss the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.
  - The Office Action asserts that the term “can be used” is an “optional use term and therefore is indefinite.” *See* Office Action, page 2, ¶4. Applicant believes that the term “can be used” defines a specific characteristic of an ELVID (i.e., that the ELVID is capable of being used to access one of the plurality of logical volumes on at least two of the plurality of storage systems) and does not recite an optional use of an ELVID, and would like to discuss this point.
- Applicant would like to discuss the rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as purportedly being unpatentable over Baranovsky (5,897,661).
  - The Office Action asserts that there is no requirement in claim 26 that the plurality of storage systems exist on more than one computer. *See* Office Action, page 18, lines 3-5. Applicant would like to discuss a possible amendment to claim 1 to clarify that the plurality of storage systems are separate computers.

- Applicant would like to discuss the rejection of claims 1, 27, 29, 31, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over Baranovsky in view of Hubis (6,343,324).

A. The Office Action states, “[i]n response to applicant’s argument that ‘in the system of Baranovsky et. al. there is no physical address specified that the system can verify’ is acknowledged but not deemed to be persuasive. The Examiner points to Baranovsky et. al. column 6, lines 32-51 wherein the physical address to the disk drive 42 conventionally takes the form of a five byte address. The Examiner maintains that the combination of Baranovsky et. al. with the teaching of Hubis et. al. discloses the argued limitation. See page 20, lines 3-9.

- Applicant does not deny that the system of Baranovsky employs physical disk addresses in accessing data stored on the computer. However, these physical addresses are not specified in a user’s access request. Rather, a user of the computer accesses data by opening a file in the file system. Thus, the user’s request includes a file name or path, but not a physical address.
- Applicant would like to discuss whether the Examiner agrees with this reading of Baranovsky and, if so, why the Examiner believes that one of skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Baranovsky in the manner asserted in the Office Action.

B. The Office Action asserts that Hubis discloses, “verifying that the mapping between a logical volume identifier and the physical storage location of its corresponding logical volume is correct,” because Hubis discloses granting or

denying access to storage devices based on the mapping structure of the system. *See* Office Action, page 20, lines 14-17.

- Applicant would like to discuss how what the Examiner means by the “mapping structure of the system.” Applicant would also like to discuss the difference between verifying a mapping between a logical volume identifier and the physical storage location of its corresponding logical volume and determining whether a user has access to a particular logical volume.

Respectfully submitted,

*David Black, Applicant*

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Richard F. Giunta, Reg. No. 36,149  
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.  
600 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211  
Telephone: (617) 720-3500

Docket No. E0295.70119US00  
Date: November 14, 2005

## Gerwin, Scott

---

**From:** Gerwin, Scott  
**Sent:** Monday, November 14, 2005 3:03 PM  
**To:** 'neveen.abel-jalil@uspto.gov'  
**Cc:** Giunta, Rich  
**Subject:** Telephone Interview in Application Serial No. 09/605,553  
**Attachments:** Proposed Agenda for Interview with Examiner.DOC

Hi Examiner Abel-Jalil,

Attached is a proposed interview agenda for the telephone interview that we have scheduled for tomorrow, November 15, at 10 a.m.  
We will plan on speaking with you then.

Regards,

Scott Gerwin

**Scott J. Gerwin**  
[sgerwin@wolfgreenfield.com](mailto:sgerwin@wolfgreenfield.com)  
*Technology Specialist*

Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.  
600 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206  
direct dial 617.646.8243  
617.646.8000 | 617.646.8646 fax

**For more information about Wolf Greenfield, please visit us at <http://www.wolfgreenfield.com>**

---

*This e-mail message and any attachments may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me immediately by replying to this message and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments. Thank you.*

11/21/2005